

Department of Energy

Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office P.O. Box 98608 Las Vegas, NV 89193-8608

NOV 0 2 1994

Les E. Shephard Technical Project Officer for Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Project Sandia National Laboratories P.O. Box 5800, Mail Stop 1333 Albuquerque, NM 87185

EVALUATION OF RESPONSE TO CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (CAR) YM-94-087 RESULTING FROM YUCCA MOUNTAIN QUALITY ASSURANCE -DIVISION (YMQAD) AUDIT YMP 94-09 OF SANDIA NATIONAL LABORATORIES (SNL) (SCPB: N/A)

The YMQAD staff has evaluated the response to CAR YM-94-087. The response has been determined to be unsatisfactory because it does not acceptably resolve the noted conditions. The reasons to support this determination are as follows:

- 1. Your response indicates that no remedial action will be taken due to time and events. This is unacceptable in that the condition identified one instance (CAR 93-36) where determination of significance was not documented on the CAR. This was identified as a correctable condition by the CAR originator during the audit. Secondly, two CARs (93-36 and 94-25) were closed without completion of verification of corrective action. SNL must either verify that all corrective action required by these CARs were implemented as stated or provide specific documented justification as to why it is not necessary to complete the verification. In all other conditions identified by the CAR, please provide justification as to specifically (discuss each CAR) why corrections to these conditions cannot be implemented. The response you provided, time and events, is not adequate justification to inhibit remedial action.
- 2. Your response indicates that the extent of the deficiency will be limited to fiscal year (FY) 1994. Would you please indicate why the evaluation is being limited to FY 1994 when conditions were identified in CAR YM-94-087 that were performed in FY 1993. Please provide justification for limiting the evaluation of the extent of deficiency.

9411080241 941102 PDR WASTE WM-11 PDR

YMP-5

Les E. Shephard

- 3. Your response to root cause determination indicates the cause related to a lack of attention to detail and proper guidance. This response does not address root cause. First, the procedural requirements appear to be very explicit and interpretation is easily understood. If the individuals that performed these activities were trained in the procedures as required by the SNL Indoctrination and Training Program, the conditions in this CAR should not have occurred. Please respond to the following questions: Was the SNL Indoctrination and Training procedures in assuring understanding of the SNL implementing procedures? What is the cause of lack of attention to detail? Please explain the guidance that you refer to in your response. Is this part of the Indoctrination and Training Program?
- 4. Your response indicates that the corrective action to prevent recurrence will include a refresher training course that will specify each aspect of the corrective action process. If all of the responsible individuals who implement the corrective action program have received indoctrination and training into the SNL corrective action procedures, why is it felt that additional training is going to effectively prevent recurrence of the noted conditions in CAR YM-94-087? Please provide the detailed rational to support this conclusion. In addition, has anyone evaluated the adequacy of the implementing procedures for corrective action to determine if clarification may be needed?

An amended response is required to be submitted to this office within ten working days of the date of this letter. Send the original of your response to Deborah Sult, YMQAD/QATSS, 101 Convention Center Drive, Suite 640, Las Vegas, Nevada 89109. If an extension to the due date is necessary, it must be requested in writing, with appropriate justification, prior to that date.

If you have any questions, please contact either Robert B. Constable at (702) 794-7945 or Richard L. Maudlin at (702) 794-7290.

atherine tempton for

Richard E. Spence, Director Yucca Mountain Quality Assurance Division

YMOAD:RBC-516

Enclosure: CAR YM-94-087

W. L. Belke, NRC, Las Vegas, NV D. G. Sult, YMQAD/QATSS, Las Vegas, NV

е^н С

NOV 0 2 1994

1

	, Č	TH	S IS A RED STAMP
² RADIOACTIVE WA U.S. DEPARTM	OF CIVILIAN ASTE MANAGEMI IENT OF ENERGY GTON, D.C.	ENT PAGE	NO.: <u>YM-94-087</u> : <u>1</u> OF <u>2</u> QA
·····			
	ACTION REQUES		
1 Controlling Document QAIP 16-01, Revisions 1, 2 and 3, Corrective Action		2 Related Report No. YMP-94-09	
3 Responsible Organization 4	Discussed With		<u> </u>
SNL	J. Voight/C. Jarami	lo/D. Hawkins	מכ
5 Requirement:			
 A. Section 6.1, Step 2 states: SNL YMP QA sha a significant condition adverse to quality B. Section 6.2, Step 1 states in part: "Resp shallidentify proposed remedial action indicates remedial actions are to include previously completed work and an investig 	y as defined in Subs onsible Mgt PI/TL s" (Note: Sect. a determination of	ection 3.8." ion 3.6 impact on	
adverse condition.) C. Section 6.4, Step 1 states in part: "s completion of corrective actions and docu used to verify completion and effectivene all deviation remedial actions were compl	ment objective evide as of those actions.	nce that was Verify	
Contrary to the above, objective evidence (SNL 94-11, 94-12, and 94-25) reviewed reveals that where determination of significance was not ad reviewed, remedial actions did not include a d previously completed work and an investigation	: (1) there was one dressed, (2) in all letermination of impa into the extent of	case noted out one case ct on the adverse	:
Contrary to the above, objective evidence (SNL 94-11, 94-12, and 94-25) reviewed reveals that where determination of significance was not ad reviewed, remedial actions did not include a d	: (1) there was one dressed, (2) in all letermination of impa into the extent of cations of correctiv is used to verify com stances CARS were clo	case noted out one case out on the adverse e action do oletion and	
 94-11, 94-12, and 94-25) reviewed reveals that where determination of significance was not ad reviewed, remedial actions did not include a d previously completed work and an investigation condition, (3) in all but one instance, verifi not detail specific objective evidence that wa effectiveness of those actions, (4) in two ins verification of completion of all corrective a ⁹ Does a Significant Condition Adverse to Quality exist? Yes X_No YesNo 	: (1) there was one dressed, (2) in all letermination of impa into the extent of cations of correctiv is used to verify com stances CARS were clo	tase noted but one case of on the adverse e action do pletion and sed without 13F y of SWO 20	Response Due Date: Working Days om Issuance
9 Does a Significant Condition All B C D E 10 9 Does a Significant Condition All B C D E 10 9 Does a Significant Condition 10 Yes No 10 Yes No Yes No Yes No	:: (1) there was one dressed, (2) in all letermination of impa in into the extent of cations of correctiv is used to verify com stances CARs were clo action.	case noted but one case ct on the adverse e action do pletion and sed without 13F y of SWO 20 C Fr	Working Days om Issuance
Contrary to the above, objective evidence (SNL 94-11, 94-12, and 94-25) reviewed reveals that where determination of significance was not ad reviewed, remedial actions did not include a d previously completed work and an investigation condition, (3) in all but one instance, verifi not detail specific objective evidence that wa effectiveness of those actions, (4) in two ins verification of completion of all corrective a 9 Does a Significant Condition Adverse to Quality exist? Yes <u>x</u> No If Yes. Check One: A B C D E If Yes. Check 11 Required Actions: A Remedial Extent of Deficie	: (1) there was one dressed, (2) in all letermination of impa a into the extent of cations of correctiv is used to verify com stances CARs were clo action.	case noted but one case ct on the adverse e action do pletion and sed without sed without 13F y of SWO C Fr surrence X Rc	Working Days om Issuance
Contrary to the above, objective evidence (SNL 94-11, 94-12, and 94-25) reviewed reveals that where determination of significance was not ad reviewed, remedial actions did not include a d previously completed work and an investigation condition, (3) in all but one instance, verifi not detail specific objective evidence that wa effectiveness of those actions, (4) in two ins verification of completion of all corrective a ⁹ Does a Significant Condition Adverse to Quality exist? Yes X_No If Yes. Check One: A B C D E If Yes. Check ¹¹ Required Actions: A remedial Extent of Deficie ¹² Recommended Actions: 1. For Item 1 in Block 6, evaluate CAR 93-36 results (remedial only). 2. For Item 2 in Block 6, the following is r	 (1) there was one dressed, (2) in all dressed, (3) in all dressed, (3) in all dressed, (3) in all dressed, (3) in all dressed, (2) in all dressed, (3) in al	case noted but one case ct on the adverse e action do pletion and sed without sed without 13F y of SWO C Fr surrence X Rc	Working Days
Contrary to the above, objective evidence (SNL 94-11, 94-12, and 94-25) reviewed reveals that where determination of significance was not ad reviewed, remedial actions did not include a previously completed work and an investigation condition, (3) in all but one instance, verifi not detail specific objective evidence that wa effectiveness of those actions, (4) in two ins verification of completion of all corrective a sverification of completion of all corrective a If Yes. Check One: A B C D F If Secommended Actions: For Item 1 in Block 6, evaluate CAR 93-36 results (remedial only). For Item 2 in Block 6, the following is r A. Determine that extent of this defici	: (1) there was one dressed, (2) in all letermination of impa into the extent of cations of correctiv is used to verify com- stances CARs were clo action. op work condition exist? o <u>X</u> ; If Yes - Attach cop- eck One: $\Box A \Box B$ ency \overleftarrow{X} Preclude Rec 6 for significance and recommended: iency.	ase noted but one case of on the adverse e action do pletion and sed without y of SWO C Fr urrence X d document	Working Days om Issuance
Contrary to the above, objective evidence (SNL 94-11, 94-12, and 94-25) reviewed reveals that where determination of significance was not ad reviewed, remedial actions did not include a d previously completed work and an investigation condition, (3) in all but one instance, verifi not detail specific objective evidence that wa effectiveness of those actions, (4) in two ins verification of completion of all corrective a ⁹ Does a Significant Condition Adverse to Quality exist? Yes X_No If Yes. Check One: A B C D E for the following is results (remedial only). ¹⁰ Recommended Actions: 1. For Item 1 in Block 6, the following is r A. Determine that extent of this defici 7 Initiator Richard L. Maudlin Mach. ()/os//1	 (1) there was one dressed, (2) in all dressed for corrective to the extent of corrective trances CARs were cloated to verify composition exist? (2) work condition exist? (3) work condition exist? (4) work condition exist? (2) work condition exist? (3) work condition exist? (4) work condition exist? (4) the extent of the extent of the exist of	ase noted but one case of on the adverse e action do pletion and sed without y of SWO 20 Fr currence X Ro d document	Working Days om Issuance
Contrary to the above, objective evidence (SNL 94-11, 94-12, and 94-25) reviewed reveals that where determination of significance was not ad reviewed, remedial actions did not include a previously completed work and an investigation condition, (3) in all but one instance, verifi not detail specific objective evidence that wa effectiveness of those actions, (4) in two ins verification of completion of all corrective a ⁹ Does a Significant Condition Adverse to Quality exist? Yes X_No If Yes. Check One: A B C D E Hyes. Che ¹¹ Required Actions: 1. For Item 1 in Block 6, evaluate CAR 93-36 results (remedial only). 2. For Item 2 in Block 6, the following is r A. Determine that extent of this defici 7 Initiator	 (1) there was one dressed, (2) in all dressed, (3) in al	ase noted but one case of on the adverse e action do pletion and sed without y of SWO 20 Fr currence X Ro d document	Working Days om Issuance oot Cause Determination
Contrary to the above, objective evidence (SNL 94-11, 94-12, and 94-25) reviewed reveals that where determination of significance was not ad reviewed, remedial actions did not include a d previously completed work and an investigation condition, (3) in all but one instance, verifi not detail specific objective evidence that wa effectiveness of those actions, (4) in two ins verification of completion of all corrective a 9 Does a Significant Condition Adverse to Quality exist? Yes X_No YesNo If Yes. Check One: XA \B B C C D B E If Yes. Che 11 Required Actions: X Remedial X Extent of Deficie 12 Recommended Actions: 1. For Item 1 in Block 6, evaluate CAR 93-36 results (remedial only). 2. For Item 2 in Block 6, the following is r A. Determine that extent of this deficie 7 Initiator Richard L. Maudlin Mach(01/00/3). 15 Response Accepted QAR Date	 (1) there was one dressed, (2) in all dressed, (2) is used to verify comparison of corrective dressed to verify dressed to verify comparison of corrective dressed to verify comparison of corrective dressed to verify dres	case noted but one case ct on the adverse e action do pletion and sed without sed without y of SWO C Fr surrence X d document	Working Days om Issuance oot Cause Determination
Contrary to the above, objective evidence (SNL 94-11, 94-12, and 94-25) reviewed reveals that where determination of significance was not ad reviewed, remedial actions did not include a d previously completed work and an investigation condition, (3) in all but one instance, verifi not detail specific objective evidence that wa effectiveness of those actions, (4) in two ins verification of completion of all corrective a Adverse to Quality exist? Yes X_No If Yes. Check One: XA B C D E Hys. Che ¹¹ Required Actions: X Remedial X Extent of Deficie ¹² Recommended Actions: 1. For Item 1 in Block 6, evaluate CAR 93-36 results (remedial only). 2. For Item 2 in Block 6, the following is r A. Determine that extent of this defici ⁷ Initiator Richard L. Maudlin Mach(01/08/20	 (1) there was one dressed, (2) in all dressed, (2) is used to verify comparison of corrective stances of corrective dressed to verify comparison of corrective dressed to verify dressed to verify comparison of corrective dressed to verify comparison of corrective dressed to verify dressed	case noted but one case ct on the adverse e action do pletion and sed without sed without y of SWO C Fr surrence X d document	Working Days om Issuance bot Cause Determination Date 9/62/94
Contrary to the above, objective evidence (SNL 94-11, 94-12, and 94-25) reviewed reveals that where determination of significance was not ad reviewed, remedial actions did not include a d previously completed work and an investigation condition, (3) in all but one instance, verifi not detail specific objective evidence that wa effectiveness of those actions, (4) in two ins verification of completion of all corrective a 9 Does a Significant Condition Adverse to Quality exist? Yes X_No If Yes. Check One: SA DB DC D DE If Yes. Che 11 Required Actions: [X] Remedial [X] Extent of Deficie 12 Recommended Actions: 1. For Item 1 in Block 6, evaluate CAR 93-36 results (remedial only). 2. For Item 2 in Block 6, the following is r A. Determine that extent of this defici 7 Initiator Richard L. Maudlin Mard. []. 15 Response Accepted OAR Date	 (1) there was one dressed, (2) in all letermination of impa a into the extent of incations of corrective constances cars were cloated to verify comparate cars were cloated to a constance of the constan	case noted but one case ction ction case case	Working Days om Issuance bot Cause Determination Date 9/62/94
Contrary to the above, objective evidence (SNL 94-11, 94-12, and 94-25) reviewed reveals that where determination of significance was not ad reviewed, remedial actions did not include a d previously completed work and an investigation condition, (3) in all but one instance, verifi not detail specific objective evidence that wa effectiveness of those actions, (4) in two ins verification of completion of all corrective a 9 Does a Significant Condition Adverse to Quality exist? Yes X_No If Yes. Check One: A B C D E H Yes. Che 11 Required Actions: A Remedial Extent of Deficie 12 Recommended Actions: 1. For Item 1 in Block 6, evaluate CAR 93-36 results (remedial only). 2. For Item 2 in Block 6, the following is r A. Determine that extent of this defici 7 Initiator Richard L. Maudlin Maulin ()// 0 // 0 // 0 // 0 // 0 // 0 // 0 //	 (1) there was one dressed, (2) in all dressed, (2) is used to verify comparison of corrective dressed to verify comparison of comparison of comparison of comparison of comparison of comparison of comp	case noted but one case ction ction case case	Working Days om Issuance bot Cause Determination Date 9/12/94 Date

Exhibit QAP-16.1.1

-

.

بربر بر

ENCLOSUSE

--

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN			
RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT			
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY			
WASHINGTON, D.C.			

8 CAR NO .: YM-94-087	•,
PAGE: 2 OF 2	_
QA	

80.

- :##

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (CONTINUATION PAGE)

13 Recommended Action(s) (continued)

- B. Identify the cause of the condition.
- C. Determine what actions are necessary to preclude reoccurrence.
- D. Identify the impact on quality due to not implementing this requirement.
- 3. For Item 3 in Block 6, the following is recommended: (see recommended actions for Item 2 above)
- 4. For SNL CARS 93-36 and 94-25 in Item 4 of Block 6, take the necessary action to complete verification of ALL items identified in the response to the CARS. Also, evaluate the extent of the identified condition and what actions will be taken to preclude reoccurrence.

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY WASHINGTON, D.C.

8	CAR NO.	<u>Y</u>	YM-94-087		
	PAGE:	-			
			QA		

CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST (CONTINUATION PAGE)

CAR YM-94-087

s • • •

- A. Remedial Action: For the cited internal SNL YMP CARs, which are all closed, no specific remedial action will be taken, since the situations documented in the CARs have all been overtaken by time and events. Action to preclude recurrence, specified below, will be more significant in correcting this situation.
- B. Extent of the Deficiency: All SNL YMP CARs for FY 94 will be reviewed for evidence of the deficiencies cited in Block 6, above. (Responsible party: J. Voigt; Anticipated Completion Date: October 31, 1994)
- C. Root Cause Determination: The four cited discrepancies can be attributed to a lack of attention to detail on the part of QA personnel involved. Additionally, some of the personnel had not received enough guidance for them to be aware of the specifics that needed to be addressed.
- D. Actions to Preclude Recurrence: All QA personnel involved in CAR verification activities will receive refresher training that will specify each aspect of the corrective action process, so that these types of discrepancies will not occur in the future. (Responsible individual: J. C. Friend; Anticipated Completion Date: November 30, 1994)

10/13/qy LTR. SHEPHARD TO SPENCE

10/12/94 For

L. E. Shephard SNL YMP Technical Project Officer